



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/360,719	07/27/1999	PAUL C. ROGERS	3548/010	4567
21186	7590	04/21/2005	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ANWAH, OLISA	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2645		
DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/360,719	ROGERS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Olisa Anwah	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-309 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3,8-16,25,26,31-35,37-138,140,141,158-269,274-282 and 287-309 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4-7,17-24,27-30,36,139,142-157,270-273 and 283-286 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-7, 17-23, 27-29, 270-273 and 283-286 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,533,102 (hereinafter Robinson) in view of Bobo II, U.S. Patent No. 6,564,321 (hereinafter Bobo).

Regarding claim 1, Robinson discloses a call management system (10) comprising:

at least one user position, comprising a computer workstation (14, Figures 1 and 4) and associated telephone apparatus (12, Figures 1 and 4);  
a call management computer (38+26, Figures 1 and 4);

Art Unit: 2645

a digital data network connecting the workstation of said at least one user position with said call management computer (Figure 4);

said call management computer including means for intercepting an incoming call to said at least one user position (col. 7, lines 24-30);

a storage means for storing at least one processing rule for determining how an intercepted call is to be processed (see Figure 5);

means for determining that the intercepted call is for said at least one user position (col. 7, lines 24-30);

means for interacting with the workstation of said at least one user position to determine how the intercepted call is to be processed (col. 7, lines 30-34 to col. 8, line 67);

means for processing the call according to instructions received from the workstation of the user (columns 6-9 and Figures 3-8);

means for allowing a user to modify the at least one processing rule (see Figure 7);

wherein said call management computer includes means for identifying the calling party and (col. 8, line 52 and Figure 5).

Art Unit: 2645

wherein said at least one processing rule is selected based on at least one of the call type and the calling party (see Figure 5).

Note: Units 124, 126, 128, 130, 132 and 134 of Robinson are functionally equivalent to the claimed call-processing rules because these options determine how an intercepted call is to be processed. Because the called party may choose one of these options (122), Robinson discloses the claimed selecting limitation.

Further regarding claim 1, Robinson does not disclose said call management computer includes means for identifying a call type for the incoming call. However Bobo teaches this limitation (see abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Robinson with the identifying means taught by Bobo. This modification would have improved the versatility of Robinson by allowing the auto attendant system to receive various kinds of messages as suggested by Bobo.

Regarding claim 4, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 5, see abstract of Bobo.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 6, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 7, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 17, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 18, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 19, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 20, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 21, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 22, see abstract of Bobo.

Regarding claim 23, see column 14 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 27, see column 14 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 28, see column 14 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 29, see column 14 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 270, see column 7 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 271, see column 7 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 272, see column 7 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 273, see column 7 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 283, see column 7 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 284, see column 7 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 285, see column 7 of Bobo.

Regarding claim 286, see column 7 of Bobo.

3. Claim 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson combined with Bobo in further

Art Unit: 2645

view of Klingman, U.S. Patent No. 5,721,729 (hereinafter Klingman).

Regarding claim 24, Robinson combined with Bobo does not disclose means for identifying said fax calls by detecting ISDN messages. However, Klingman discloses a means for identifying said fax calls by detecting ISDN messages (col. 10, lines 25-35). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Robinson combined with Bobo with a means for identifying fax calls by detecting ISDN messages as taught by Klingman. This modification would have improved the accuracy of Bobo by providing a universal call processing system that can detect and process all information types transmitted through a telephone line via an ISDN network.

Claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 24.

4. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson combined with Bobo in further view of Monnot et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,432,618 (hereinafter Monnot).

Regarding claim 36, Robinson combined with Bobo does not disclose the limitation of, "a system wherein an identifying message is returned to the calling fax machine which confirms the identity of the called party". Monot discloses this

Art Unit: 2645

limitation (see abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Robinson combined with Bobo to include a system wherein an identifying message is returned to the calling fax machine which confirms the identity of the called party as taught by Monot. This modification would have improved the reliability of Bobo by allowing for the certification of fax transmissions.

5. Claims 139 and 142-156 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson combined with Bobo in further view of Pepe et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,742,905 (hereinafter Pepe).

With respect to claim 139, Robinson combined with Bobo does not disclose the types of calls determine, at least in part, the at least one processing rule. However Pepe discloses this limitation (see col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 35). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Robinson and Bobo with a system wherein the types of calls determine, at least in part, the at least one call processing rule as taught by Pepe. This modification would improved the flexibility of Robinson by allowing the user to

Art Unit: 2645

establish a set of rules that specify how the user is to be notified of various types of messages as suggested by Pepe (see col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 142, see col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 35 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 143, see Figure 7 of Robinson.

Regarding claim 144, see col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 35 of Pepe. Also see Figure 7 of Robinson.

Regarding claim 145, see col. 3, lines 15-25 of Pepe. Also see column 31 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 146, see col. 3, lines 15-25 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 147, see column 31 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 148, see Figure 5 of Robinson. Also see col. 3, lines 15-25 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 149, see Figure 5 of Robinson. Also see col. 3, lines 15-25 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 150, see column 30 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 152, see Figure 44 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 153, see columns 29 and 30 of Pepe. Also see Figure 44 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 154, see Figure 44 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 155, see col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 35 of Pepe.

Regarding claim 156, see col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 35 of Pepe. Also see Figure 44 of Pepe.

6. Claim 157 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson combined with Bobo and Pepe in view of Kondo, U.S. Patent No. 5,490,205 (hereinafter Kondo).

Regarding claim 157, Robinson combined with Bobo and Pepe does not disclose the call processing rule specifies at least in part that a special ringing sound should be used for the call. However Kondo disclose a system wherein a call processing rule specifies at least in part that a special ringing sound should be used for a call (col. 1, lines 50-60). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Robinson combined with Bobo and Pepe to include a system wherein a call processing rule specifies at least in part that a special ringing sound should be used for a call as taught by Kondo. This modification would have improved the cumulative features of the system by allowing a user to know whether or not a caller is important to him.

7. Claim 151 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson combined with Bobo and Pepe in

further view of Norris et al, U.S. Patent Application  
Publication No. 2002/0080776 (hereinafter Norris).

Regarding claim 151, the combination of Robinson, Bobo and Pepe fails to teach the other destination is a destination on the Internet. All the same, Norris teaches this limitation (see abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Robinson, Bobo and Pepe with a system wherein the other destination is a destination on the Internet as taught by Norris. This modification would allow for calls to be received via an Internet Phone as suggested by Norris.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant alleges Robinson does not teach selecting a processing rule based on the call type and the calling party. However Applicant's claims do not recite selecting a processing rule based on the call type and the calling party. Applicant broadly claims said at least one processing rule is selected based on at least one of the call type and the calling party. Because Robinson discloses said processing rule is selected based on the caller, Robinson discloses said at least one

processing rule is selected based on at least one of the call type and the calling party.

***Citation of Pertinent Prior Art***

9. McKendry et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,356 (hereinafter McKendry) is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McKendry teaches at least one call processing rule is selected based on the call type (abstract) and the calling party (col. 31, lines 1-5). McKendry further teaches a pre-programmed call management computer (100) selects the call-processing rule.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated

Art Unit: 2645

from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

O.A.

Olisa Anwah  
Patent Examiner  
April 7, 2005



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600